



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/309,831	05/11/1999	THOMAS C. MIELENHAUSEN	90021-3	8013

32300 7590 09/25/2002

BRIGGS AND MORGAN, P.A.
2400 IDS CENTER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176

DATE MAILED: 09/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/309,831

Applicant(s)

MIELENHAUSEN, THOMAS C.

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2 & 3. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: the application filed on 5/11/99, and the IDSs filed on 8/9/99 and 5/29/01.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 15, 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lu et al. (US Pat No. 5,410,475, 4/25/95, filed 4/19/93).

Regarding independent claim 1 and its dependent 9-10, Lu discloses:

- selecting a word in the text to be converted to an abbreviation and converting the selected word to a corresponding abbreviation (figure 2, #210-220; figures 3A, 3B; col 1, lines 21-27, 49-68)
- selecting an abbreviation in the text to be converted to a word and converting the abbreviation to a word (col 1, lines 60-68, col 6, line 14 to col 8, lines 1-49)

Lu does not disclose storing in the memory a first data encoding a plurality of words and corresponding abbreviations and a second data structure encoding a plurality of abbreviations and corresponding words, displaying a list of suggested words and

Art Unit: 2176

abbreviations corresponding to the selected word and abbreviation, and receiving input from the user to choose the desired word or abbreviation.

Instead, Lu discloses the text in the memory containing a list of words and correspondent abbreviations (col 5, lines 20-68; col 6, line 14 to col 8, lines 1-49, the list of words and the corresponding abbreviations is stored in the memory as data for performing the conversion function).

It would have been obvious to an ordinary skill at the time of the invention was made to have modified Lu to include storing in the memory a first data encoding a plurality of words and corresponding abbreviations and a second data structure encoding a plurality of abbreviations and corresponding words for the following reason.

Lu teaching of lists of words and phrases and corresponding abbreviations suggests *storing in the memory two different data structures for two different lists of words and abbreviations*. Also, it was well known in the art that once said lists are in the memory, the lists can be displayed for manipulating including selecting an item in the list by a user.

Regarding claims 2 and 16, Lu discloses editing, updating and customizing the data structures which are words and corresponding abbreviations (col 3, lines 17-36; col 5, lines 20-68).

Regarding claims 3-6, Lu does not disclose that the word or an abbreviation is selected by a user using a keyboard command or using a mouse. However, it would have been

obvious to an ordinary skill at the time of the invention was made to have included these features in Lu since it was well known in the art that any computer system comprises a keyboard and a mouse for user interaction performance such as selecting an item in a document.

Regarding claims 7-8, 11-12, Lu discloses:

- parsing the text for words and phrases to be converted to abbreviations (figure 2, #216; col 4, lines 20-60; figure 3A, steps 313, 315, 317, 316, 323, 318, 319, 326; figure 3B, steps 327, 330, 333, 332)
- a list of abbreviations and corresponding words or phrases (col 6, line 17 to col 8, lines 1-49)

Lu does not disclose scanning text for abbreviations to be converted to corresponding words, displaying a list of suggested abbreviations corresponding to the selected words and receiving input from the user to choose the desired abbreviation and vice versa.

However, as seen in Lu, the purpose of said parsing is to trace the tokens to get the abbreviation of a word or a phrase, which is considered equivalent to scanning the text.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to an ordinary skill at the time of the invention

was made to have applied Lu to have the scanning text for abbreviations to be converted to corresponding words and to generate a list of words or phrases and corresponding abbreviations. Also, it was well known in the art to display the list of abbreviations and corresponding words or phrases for user selecting once the lists are stored in the memory.

Regarding claims 13-14, Lu discloses selecting an abbreviation in the text to be converted (col 1, lines 49-67, figure 2; col 4, lines 20-59, selecting "IBM" for "International Business Machine"; figure 3B, #332). Lu does not disclose inserting the abbreviation into the text at a position selected by the user.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Lu to include inserting the abbreviation into the text at a position selected by the user since it was well known in the art to use the cut/copy and paste method or the drag-and-drop method for inserting a selected data into the text at a position selected by the user.

Independent claim 15 includes the same limitations as in claims 1, 9-10, and 13-14, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Independent claim 17 and its dependent claim 22 are for a data processing apparatus for performing the method claims 1, 9-10, and 13, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 18-22 are for a data processing apparatus of method claims 7-8, 11-12, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chicorel (US Pat No. 6,192,345, 2/20/01, filed 1/27/99, priority 3/21/97).

Levin (US Pat No. 4,760,528, 7/26/88).

Nakamura et al. (US Pat No. 4,866,646, 9/12/89).

Holm et al. (US Pat No. 5,850,629, 12/15/98, filed 9/9/96).

Kudrolli et al. (US Pat No. 6,279,018 B1, 8/21/01, filed 2/23/99).

Schmitt et al., *An Experimental Study of Synthesized Speech Intelligibility Using Text Created by Telecommunication Device for the Deaf (TDD) Users*, IEEE, 12/1990, pages 996-999, vol.2.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 703-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 703-308-5186. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 707-746-7238 for After Final communications.


Application/Control Number: 09/309,831

Page 7

Art Unit: 2176

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9000.

clh
9/16/02


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER